making a relief for each microcomponent by mechanical machining of the substrate, the mechanical machining comprising moving at lest one tool translationally and parallel to the substrate, the vertical dimension of the microrelief being in the range between 10 microns to 600 microns; and

cutting out the microcomponents in the substrate such that the individual microcomponents or groups of microcomponents are separated from each other.

REMARKS

Status

Applicants appreciate the time and consideration of the Examiner in the examination of this application. Claims 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as their invention. Claims 14, 16-20, and 22-25 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over US Patent 4,016,855 to Mimata et al. (hereinafter Mimata). Claims 15, 21, and 26 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over US Patent Mimata in view of U.S. Patent 5,868,125 to Maoujoud (hereinafter Maoujoud). Claims 14, 17, and 22 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over US Patent 351,874 to Maloy.

Claim 21 is objected to for a misspelling

Amendments

Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly point out the invention. Claim 21 has been amended to correct a spelling error. It is believed that no new matter has been added. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with Markings to Show Changes Made"**.

The §112 Rejection of Claims 16 and 23

Claims 16 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as their invention.

Claim 16

Claim 16, as rewritten, is fairly self-explanatory. As such, the rejection of this Claim 16 under §112 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23

Claim 23 refers to a blade that does not have grit placed onto it. However, the blade carries abrasive distributed in the microreliefs. The Examiner correctly identified the function in his analysis relative to the rejection of Claim 23. As such, the rejection of this Claim 16 under §112 is respectfully traversed.

The §102 Rejection of Claims 14, 16-20 and 22-25

Claims 14, 16-20, and 22-25 stand rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over US Patent 4,016,855 to Mimata. Claims 14 is an independent claim. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), in order to find a proper rejection under §102, every one of the claimed elements must be found in the single cited art.

Claim 14 is directed to a method for making microcomponents exhibiting microreliefs of an optical quality. The method includes a step of making a microrelief for each microcomponent by mechanical machining of the substrate, the mechanical machining comprising moving at lest one tool translationally and parallel to the substrate, the mechanical machining not carried out through the thickness of the substrate; and

2) cutting out the microcomponents in the substrate such that the individual microcomponents or groups of microcomponents are separated from each other.

Mimata does not show the mechanical machining that stops short of being carried out through the thickness of the substrate. In this manner, the requirements of §102 cannot be met.

All the remaining claims depend from Claim 14. As such, the remaining claims being dependent on an allowable claim, are themselves allowable for the reasons stated

above, among others. Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 16-20 and 22-25 in view of Mimata are respectfully traversed.

The §103 Rejection of Claims 15, 21, and 26 over Mimata in view of Maoujoud

Claims 15, 21, and 26 depend from Claim 14. Since Claim 14 is ostensibly allowable in light of Mimata, it is believed that these claims are as well. In addition to the portions of Claims 14 that are not shown, Claims 15, 21, and 26 add other portions as well. Maoujoud does not show or suggest the shortcomings of Mimata. As such, the rejections of Claims 15, 21, and 26 over Mimata in view of Maoujoud are traversed.

The §103 Rejection of Claims 14, 17, and 22 over Maloy

First, Applicants strenuously object to Maloy teaches "making microcomponents", since Maloy is dated to 1886. It strains credulity to envision that a craftsman of the 19th century would be concerned with, or building a machine that, makes reliefs on the order of less than 1000 microns, and the slab of Maloy cannot be shown to be a microcomponent having such microreliefs. As such, the rejection of Claim 14 under Maloy is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 22 depend from Claim 14. Since Claim 14 is ostensibly allowable in light of Maloy, it is believed that these claims are as well. In addition to the portions of Claims 14 that are not shown, Claims 17 and 22 add other portions as well. Maloy does not show or suggest the shortcomings of Mimata. As such, the rejections of Claims 17 and 22 over Maloy are traversed.

Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Our check in the amount of $1,140.00 is attached covering any required fees including a 2 month extension fee.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP

Dated: July 15, 2002

J. Davis Gilmer
Reg. No. 44,711

THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800

"Version with Markings to Show Changes Made"

(Twice Amended) A method for making microcomponents exhibiting microreliefs of an optical quality, comprising:

-making a microrelief for each microcomponent by mechanical machining of the substrate, the mechanical machining comprising moving at lest one tool translationally and parallel to the substrate, the mechanical machining not carried out through the thickness of the substrate; and

- cutting out the microcomponents in the substrate such that the individual microcomponents or groups of microcomponents are separated from each other.

16. (Twice Amended) A method according to Claim 14, wherein making a microrelief is performed to an extent of [obtaining optical quality of] the microrelief being optically polished.

21. (Twice Amended) A method according to Claim 14, [whrein] wherein the microprisms are made by a V profile abrasive blade.